

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

BLAKE RIAD-JAMES MASO,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-01620-TL

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Jane Doe’s Motion for Expedited Discovery (Dkt. No. 23) and Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 24), as well as *sua sponte* (on its own behalf) for other matters. Having reviewed the relevant record, the Court STRIKES the motions as moot and issues the following guidance for the Parties.

**A. Use of Pseudonym**

On November 22, 2023, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request to proceed under pseudonym. *See* Dkt. No. 21 at 5–9. The Court instructed the Clerk to change the case caption to replace Plaintiff’s actual name with “Jane Doe,” and ordered Plaintiff to refile all documents

with appropriate redactions—*i.e.*, using “Jane Doe” instead of her name—by December 22, 2023. *Id.* at 8–9. Since then, Plaintiff has filed additional documents that caption the case using her actual name and that use her actual name throughout the document, including in her signature. *See* Dkt. Nos. 23, 24, 25, 26.

Therefore, the Court issues the following guidance:

- (1) All documents filed with the Court SHALL include the case caption “Jane Doe v. Blake Riad-James Maso” and should not use Plaintiff’s actual name. For example:

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

BLAKE RIAD-JAMES MASO,

Defendant.

- (2) Plaintiff SHALL sign all filings with her actual physical signature, but she shall use her pseudonym in all other portions of a filing. If Plaintiff signs a filing using “/s/” she shall use “Jane Doe.” Plaintiff signing using the pseudonym “Jane Doe” shall have the same force and effect as if she had affixed her signature with her legal name.
- (3) Plaintiff is REMINDED that she must refile all documents she has filed with the Court since the start of this case. Plaintiff SHALL simply redact her name wherever it appears in the prior documents and file them again. Plaintiff’s actual name should not appear in these filings.
  - As stated in the Court’s prior Order (*see* Dkt. No. 21 at 8), Plaintiff’s deadline to refile these documents is **December 22, 2023**.
  - Plaintiff’s recent filings (Dkt. Nos. 23–26) SHALL be resubmitted by **January 5, 2024**.

- (4) Going forward, in all future filings, Plaintiff SHALL use the pseudonym “Jane Doe” to label the case as demonstrated above and to refer to herself in the filings. Plaintiff’s actual name should not appear in the filings. If any exhibits contain Plaintiff’s name, her name should be redacted from those exhibits prior to filing.

**B. Discovery Motions**

Plaintiff has filed two motions for discovery: (1) Motion for Expedited Discovery Under FRCP 26(d) (Dkt. No. 23); and (2) First Amended Motion to Compel Document Production (Dkt. No. 24). In both motions, Plaintiff requests that “subpoenas” be issued and that certain “individuals and agencies” be required to produce documents. *See* Dkt. No. 23 ¶ 3.1; Dkt. No. 24 ¶ 4.1. The Court finds these motions duplicative of Plaintiff’s earlier requests for subpoenas, which were issued to Plaintiff on November 29, 2023. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motions (Dkt. Nos. 23, 24) are STRICKEN as moot.

**C. Case Management**

Finally, the Court issues a word of guidance to Plaintiff. The Court notes that Plaintiff has filed multiple requests for the same relief. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. Nos. 19, 20, 23, 24 (requesting certain information from the same individuals or entities). Going forward, Plaintiff is DIRECTED to make only one filing for each substantive request of the Court, and then to wait for the Court to respond to that request. Multiple, redundant filings (making the same request) only slow down the work of the Court and cause confusion. Therefore, any future redundant filings will be stricken from the docket.

It is so ordered.

Dated this 6th day of December 2023.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tana Lin  
United States District Judge